

UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

FEB 4 - 1959

PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

The Shaw Review

(Continuing *The Shaw Bulletin*)

Published by The Shaw Society of America, Inc.,
and The Pennsylvania State University Press

Contents

Doctor Ridgeon's Deceptive Dilemma by Norbert F. O'Donnell	1
Boss Mangan, Peer Gynt and <i>Heartbreak House</i> by Robert R. Reed, Jr.	6
Bahr Describes GBS on the Platform by John J. Weisert	13
Shavian Dead Letter File Reviews	16
Shaw and Nineteenth-Century Thought by E. E. Stokes, Jr.	19
Shaw on Education by John McKiernan	21
Magnus and Orinthia on Wax by Mark Bennett	21
Ozy Pleased by Ozy	
A Continuing Check--list of Shaviana compiled and edited by Charles A. Carpenter, Jr.	24
Shavian News Notes	27

*Our souls are to have no adventures,
because adventures are dangerous.*

— GBS on censorship, in a letter
to *The Times*, November, 1913.

The Shaw Review

(Continuing *The Shaw Bulletin*)

Vol. II, No. 7

January, 1959

EDITOR Stanley Weintraub

BIBLIOGRAPHER Charles A. Carpenter, Jr.

EDITORIAL BOARD

Sara Arlen

Edward O. Lutz

William D. Chase

Benj. C. Rosset

Felix Grendon

Warren S. Smith

Archibald Henderson

Maxwell Steinhardt

TREASURER

David Marshall Holtzmann

The Shaw Review is available exclusively to members of The Shaw Society of America, Inc., and to libraries. A special subscription rate of \$3 per year is offered to libraries. Members may order extra copies of current numbers at fifty cents each. Back numbers (Vol. I, Nos. 2, 3, 7, 8, 9 & 10, and Vol. II, Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 & 6) are available at \$1 each.

The Shaw Review is published three times annually — January, May and September — by The Shaw Society of America, Inc., and The Pennsylvania State University Press. Copyright 1959 by The Shaw Society of America, Inc. All rights reserved. No material may be reprinted either wholly or in part without permission.

Address all communications concerning subscriptions, manuscript contributions, and other queries to Dr. Stanley Weintraub, Editor, *The Shaw Review*, Department of English, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pa. Unsolicited manuscripts are welcomed, but will be returned only if return postage is provided. In matters of style, *The Shaw Review* follows the *MLA Style Sheet*.

Doctor Ridgeon's Deceptive Dilemma

by Norbert F. O'Donnell¹

In his latest biography of Shaw, Archibald Henderson reminds us of the origin of *The Doctor's Dilemma*: "The leading idea of the play embodied in the title, was suggested to Shaw by a visit to Sir Almroth Wright, at St. Mary's Hospital. An assistant came in to report that a tuberculosis patient in one of the wards wanted to be added to the list of those being treated by Wright himself on his new opsonic method. The list was already overcrowded; and Wright's prompt question was, 'Is he worth it?' Shaw made a mental note that there was a play in the situation."² Critics seem to have taken it for granted that Shaw shared all of the ethical and practical assumptions lying behind Sir Almroth's staggering question and that *The Doctor's Dilemma* faithfully reflects these assumptions in its portrayal of its characters. No doubt it is for this reason that the play, despite its success on the stage, has been frequently and rather irritably attacked. In his conception of Ridgeon's dilemma, Shaw has been accused of moral blindness and of theatrical falsity reminiscent of "Sardoodledom" at its worst. It is said that he should not have permitted Ridgeon to judge his two potential patients or that Ridgeon chooses to treat the wrong man or that in any event the situation in which the doctor finds himself is simply that of a well-made play in which the lover, by the accident of his profession, is able to murder his beloved's husband with impunity. All of this seems to assume that Shaw shares Dr. Wright-Ridgeon's attitude toward his problem.

The point is that he does not. Although Shaw apparently admired Sir Almroth Wright, he does not reveal any great regard for the perceptions of the character he presumably shaped somewhat in Wright's image. The progression of *The Doctor's Dilemma* may, in fact, be found in the unfolding of a series of ironies at Ridgeon's expense. He is right in seeing that Dubedat may destroy Jennifer, but he is right very largely for dubious reasons. He is possibly wrong in taking Dubedat for a great artist. He is most obviously mistaken about Jennifer in his estimate of the effect on her of her husband's death and of the likelihood of her being willing to marry him. More important, he is blind to the qualities in Jennifer which enable her at the end of the play to deliver a quite Shavian indictment of his whole conduct in the matter of his "dilemma." The gist of her indictment — and this is central to the meaning of the play — is that he has *not* killed Dubedat because doctors do not, as Ridgeon thinks, hold the power of life and death over their patients. Moreover, it is a special scientific sort of pride and cruelty in his attitude toward life which has led him to believe that he is able to judge the value of two human lives and to make his judgment count. The final irony of the play is revealed when we realize that Shaw has been toying

¹ Professor O'Donnell teaches dramatic literature at Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio.

² George Bernard Shaw: *Man of the Century* (New York, 1956), p. 607.

throughout with the idea of a dilemma which he does not himself regard as real, his aim being a comic critique of the professional attitude which has led Ridgeon to think that it is.

Ridgeon is, of course, quite right in believing that Dubedat is very dangerous to his wife; but the reasons for the doctor's insight are somewhat ironically presented. He sees that the artist will one day do the truly despicable thing which will lead to the deluded Jennifer's suicide. Dubedat most fully bears out Ridgeon's opinion on this point when, in his death scene, he says to Jennifer: "I'll tell you a secret. I used to think that our marriage was all an affectation, and that I'd break loose and run away some day."³ No doubt we are to assume that if he had lived he would have done just that. Ridgeon's penetration into Dubedat's motives, however, is ironically sharpened by his sense of his own self-interest (his desire to marry Jennifer) and by his outraged middle-class response to the painter's unconventional behavior in matters of less significance than his possible destruction of Jennifer.

Ridgeon assumes the role of a man able to weigh objectively the value of human lives, even admitting judiciously to Sir Patrick that he must guard against being influenced by his feeling for Jennifer. Yet his shock when at the end he learns that he has never had a chance of winning her and that she has married again indicates how far from successful he has been in putting the lady out of his mind; and his judgment of Dubedat is plainly influenced by such matters as the artist's bigamous marriage to the young woman whom the doctors meet at the inn. Although Dubedat is able to give a coolly pragmatic (and Shavian) demonstration that this affair has brought no harm to anyone, Ridgeon seems to share B. B.'s hilarious conclusion: "In moral cases, a man's behavior may be quite harmless and even beneficial, when he is morally behaving like a scoundrel. And he may do great harm when he is morally acting on the highest principles. But that does not affect the fundamental truth of morality (p. 146)." The presumably detached Ridgeon passionately denounces Dubedat as a "reptile" — and reptiles, of course, are to be scotched.

It is even possible that from Shaw's point of view Ridgeon is mistaken in thinking Dubedat a great artist. True, in his dying speech he allies himself with Michaelangelo, Velasquez, and Rembrandt; and he speaks of the "message" of art. These eloquent lines, however, seem to be the only very convincing piece of evidence in the play that we are meant to take him at Ridgeon's valuation. Arthur H. Nethercot has suggested that all that we learn of his subjects, style and methods of work suggests that he is "little more than a superior sidewalk or sand-beach picture-maker, dashing off a pencil sketch of a pretty woman or coloring a romantic landscape. . . ." Certainly this is true. Furthermore, he is the sort of artist who will leave a piece of work unfinished because the person who has commissioned it has been foolish enough to pay in advance; his mind seems to be more on money than on his work. The chorus of admirers of his efforts consists of his adoring wife and a group of Philistine doctors who, with the doubtful exception of Ridgeon, know

³ *Selected Plays of Bernard Shaw* (New York, 1949-57), I, 171. All references to *The Doctor's Dilemma* are to this edition.

⁴ *Men and Supermen* (Cambridge, Mass., 1954), p. 152.

nothing of art. Is the famous dying speech, after all, an irony of the same sort at Dubedat's announcement that he is a Shavian?

Perhaps the best piece of evidence that this may be true is in the final scene between Jennifer and Ridgeon:

JENNIFER . . . I know quite well what you mean by his selfishness. He sacrificed everything for his art. In a certain sense he had even to sacrifice everybody —

RIDGEON Everybody except himself. By keeping that back he lost the right to sacrifice you, and gave me the right to sacrifice him. Which I did.

JENNIFER: [*shaking her head, pitying his error*] He was one of the men who know what women know: that self-sacrifice is vain and cowardly.

RIDGEON Yes, when the sacrifice is rejected and thrown away. Not when it becomes the food of godhead. (p. 187)

It may well be that in these lines Ridgeon for once speaks something of Shaw's mind. He is, of course, wrong in feeling that he has the power or the right to dispose of Dubedat. Surely, however, he makes a Shavian point when he argues that the sacrifices Dubedat has demanded have not become "the food of godhead" — that is, have not, as Jennifer believes, served a high purpose. The painter, the lines imply, has been merely self-centered rather than an instrument of the Life Force.

However this may be, Ridgeon's grandest errors spring from his misjudgment of Jennifer. Most obviously he fails to understand that she will idolize her dead husband in the way she does and that in any event she will not consider marrying him. More important, because he is the sort of scientific rationalist he is, he has totally failed to comprehend a religious, vital side of her nature which makes her respond to his past actions in a way which shows them in a devastatingly ironic light. Ridgeon has the wit and the clever arguments, but Jennifer has a deeper sense of the truths of life — of all truths, that is, except those which concern her wretched husband. As a result, the final scene in the picture gallery has a typically Shavian complexity. At the outset we see that Jennifer is enveloped in a ludicrous cloud of illusion. We are uneasily grateful for Ridgeon's sharp words. But slowly the tide turns as the unintellectual woman defends herself against Ridgeon's intellectuality with replies which go to the heart of the meaning of the play. In the end, Ridgeon can only turn to say something more, give it up as a bad job, and go — the god-like Man in White reduced to a much less god-like demeanor than he has earlier assumed. Neither Jennifer nor Ridgeon has been quite right or quite wrong; both remain to a degree in a world of illusion. But on the whole the honors of the contest seem to belong to Jennifer.

She defends the world of vitality and feeling against a rational mind seeking to justify a will infected by self-interest and prejudice. Jennifer knows that "Doctors think they hold the keys of life and death; but it is not their will that is fulfilled (p. 185)." Although the soul is an organ which Ridgeon has not come across in the course of his studies, Jennifer knows that it exists; it is the organ which pulses with the energy

of the Life Force. Although Ridgeon is willing to defend his overheard remark that Dubedat was a "clever brute," Jennifer lashes back with the retort that the doctor's belief in his ability to make such a judgment of another living being smacks of the pride and cruelty of the vivisector. The cleverest of the doctors, she makes us see, is actually the most dangerous. He shares the monomania of the others in that he believes that his particular cure for disease is so clearly infallible that to withhold it is to condemn a man to death; he is so much more arrogant than the others that he cannot share their real, if slightly maudlin, feeling for living beings — displayed in the attitude of Walpole and B. B. toward animals. He does not understand a truth which even the ineffable B. B. understands: "You ask me to go into the question of whether my patients are of any use either to themselves or anyone else. Well, if you apply any scientific test known to me, you will achieve a *reductio ad absurdum* (p. 152)." Which is what Ridgeon, in his deluded notion that he is involved in a soluble dilemma, achieves.

This reading of *The Doctor's Dilemma* may seem to make the play improbably subtle. Ridgeon, by far the intellectual superior of the others, is in the end the victim of Shaw's most penetratingly ironic contemplation. Jennifer, in some ways a silly woman, delivers the lines which convey the play's deepest level of meaning. Dubedat is clearly a pseudo-Shavian; yet he is permitted to show up the moral pretensions of the conventional doctors and, in his death scene, to strike the attitudes of the great artist (which he may or may not be). The list of such complexities could be extended. Yet this is the way of the post-Ibsen drama as Shaw describes it in his 1913 additions to *The Quintessence of Ibsenism*: "Never mislead an audience, was the old rule. But the new school will trick the spectator into forming a meanly false judgment, and then convict him of it in the next act, often to his grievous mortification. When you despise something you ought to take off your hat to, or admire and imitate something you ought to loathe, you cannot resist the dramatist who knows how to touch these morbid spots in you and make you see that they are morbid."² Thus the conventional spectator, presumably a victim of the Men in White myth, is expected to admire Ridgeon at the start and slowly to come to a comprehension of the depth of the doctor's folly. Thus the spectator will greet Jennifer as unquestionably the charming heroine, gain an insight into the illusions which such romantic ladies are capable of cherishing, and finally understand that, after all, on some matters these women may be capable of a deeper wisdom than over-clever and proud doctors. Thus Dubedat will quickly establish himself as a cad, will startlingly announce that he is a Shavian, and will finally appear to be — but here perhaps complexity becomes ambiguity. The point is that the technique is the technique of the modern drama as Shaw understood it.

Certainly the interpretation of *The Doctor's Dilemma* offered here is in keeping with well-known Shavian views, expressed both in dramatic dialogue and in non-dramatic prose. Ridgeon's whole "dilemma" rests on his assumption that he determines whether his patients live or die. Shaw frequently reiterates his view that doctors have no such power.

² *Selected Prose of Bernard Shaw* (New York, 1952), p. 686.

In the first act of *Too True to Be Good*, the suffering baccillus-monster at the Patient's bedside, suffering because the Patient is suffering, gets small comfort from the rather Shavian doctor:

THE MONSTER Oh, I feel so wretched! Please cure my measles.

THE DOCTOR I can't. I can't cure any disease. But I get the credit when the patients cure themselves. When she cures herself she will cure you too.⁶

In another context, speaking in his own person, Shaw contends of medical patients that "their doctors do them more harm than good. . . ." Why do most of them recover? "Because the Life Force, or Life Urge, or *Elan Vital*, or Breath of Life, or whatever you choose to call it, not only keeps us alive, but maintains a repair department which gets to work the moment a living person is attacked by an infection or disabled by a lesion of any kind."⁷ Presumably those who, like Dudebat, do not recover do not have the essential vitality. Ridgeon and B. B. have less to do with the matter than they think.

Jennifer attacks Ridgeon for thinking himself a "little god" and compares the pride and cruelty of his attitude toward Dudebat to the pride and cruelty of the vivisector. In his preface to *The Doctor's Dilemma*, Shaw's indictment of the weaknesses of the medical profession includes an indictment of the cruelties of vivisection (p. 28). Like his heroine, he makes an association between the fallibility of doctors and what he felt to be the indifference to life reflected in the "scientific priesthood" experiments on animals. Inevitably his advice to the public on the subject of doctors is: "Treat the private operator exactly as you would treat a private executioner; treat persons who profess to be able to cure disease as you treat fortune-tellers; and make it compulsory for a doctor using a brass plate to have inscribed on it, in addition to letters indicating his qualifications, these words: 'Remember that I too am mortal.'"⁸ Not having been compelled to put up the proper brass plate, Ridgeon forgets that he is mortal.

Does this view of *The Doctor's Dilemma* contradict Shaw's well-known refusal to subscribe to what he called the "dogma of the unconditional sacredness of human life"?⁹ Surely not. It is always in a political context that Shaw voices his sense of the possible necessity, however painful, of the judgment of the value of human lives and of their elimination. Thus his Julius Caesar, though he detests killing, is forced by the circumstances of the power struggle in which his destiny involves him to approve of Rufio's murder of Ftatateeta. Though he may abhor the necessity, the man of power is driven to judge the value of human lives and to act on his judgments. The doctor neither has the power nor faces the necessity.

All in all, it appears that when Shaw left Sir Almroth Wright's office with an idea for a play, his response to the doctor's "Is he worth it?" was more complex than it has usually been thought to be.

⁶ *Too True to Be Good, Village Wooing and on the Rocks* (New York, 1934), p. 41.

⁷ *Everybody's Political What's What?* (New York, 1944), p. 214.

⁸ Quoted by Archibald Henderson, *Bernard Shaw, Playboy and Prophet* (New York, 1932), p. 554.

⁹ Preface to *On the Rocks*, p. 179.

Boss Mangan, Peer Gynt and Heartbreak House

by Robert R. Reed¹

Heartbreak House, the final draft of which was completed in 1917, is customarily looked upon as George Bernard Shaw's most puzzling play. Of its principal characters, the most enigmatic is undoubtedly Boss Mangan. It is my opinion, not shared by most critics, that an understanding of Mangan is the keystone upon which an adequate interpretation of the play must ultimately depend. When we first meet Mangan, he obviously hides behind the illusion that he is a dedicated and remarkably successful businessman who disdains the slightest display of human compassion. This illusion has one major flaw, as he learns in Act II: some people, especially those whom he most wishes to impress, regard a multimillionaire not with esteem, but with contempt. From this point on, Mangan changes colors with the rapidity of a chameleon. His hard-earned self-esteem has been shattered. He breaks down and weeps; he resents the fact that he has been "shoved into a corner" and that nobody takes note of him; he later admits that he does not have any money and never did. Then he asks the question which exposes his whole misled viewpoint of life: "How are we to have any self-respect if we don't keep it up that we are better than we really are?" In seeking self-realization, it is clear that Mangan has pushed far beyond his inbred capabilities; the power and the recognition that he has attained in the world of business are derived entirely from the illusion that he has effected, namely that he is a man of outstanding ability; they are the product of deception and not of a superior genius. Meanwhile, the effort of posing as a multi-millionaire has driven him to exhaustion. His whole career, he is ultimately made to confess, has been "a dog's life." Mangan, like Peer Gynt, has taken the wrong tack in life; covetous of fame, he has selected a career that is counter to his nature. When we brush aside all the misconceptions as to Mangan's character and ask ourselves, in plain language, "Who is this misguided individual? What is his basic nature?" we are apt — as I see it — to come face to face with the twentieth-century Peer Gynt.

Prior to a remarkably long career as a dramatist, Shaw had written *The Quintessence of Ibsenism* in 1891. In this book, he manifests a comparatively special interest in Peer Gynt and makes several statements about him that anticipate the character of Boss Mangan. Shaw points out that Peer seeks "self-realization" and then adds: "The ideal of unconditional self-realization [has] its prototype [in] the pushing, competitive,

¹ Dr. Reed is an Associate Professor of English at The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pa.

² G. B. Shaw, *Heartbreak House*, in *Four Plays by Bernard Shaw*, New York (Modern Library), 1953; p. 460.

success-loving man who is the hero of the modern world."³ This description, which is intended to sum up the self-ambitious nature of Peer, anticipates precisely the later characterization of Boss Mangan. "Pushing, competitive, success-loving," Mangan is also looked upon, by the government and the people in general, as a "hero of the modern world." He is able to boast: "The Prime Minister of this country asked me to join the Government . . . as the dictator of a great public department." Indeed, it is this very fact that Shaw most deplores, the fact that narrow-minded businessmen, driven by the allure of fame and prestige, have pushed their way into positions of governmental influence. Mangan, moreover, is prompt to admit this his success has been the product of his "competitive" nature: "I may not know anything about my own machinery; but I know how to stick a ramrod into the other fellow's."⁴

Other close similtudes remain which link Boss Mangan to Peer Gynt. In *The Quintessence*, Shaw had briefly compared Peer Gynt to Don Quixote and Brand to the effect that, in seeking fame and renown, "they ignore what they are."⁵ Boss Mangan answers as precisely to this description as does Peer Gynt. The reputation of being a success has not brought him happiness: like the middle-aged Peer Gynt, Mangan senses an aching void, something missing from his life. He complains: "I don't want to be regarded merely as a successful man. I have an imagination like anyone else." Almost immediately he adds, "But if you only knew —" and then breaks off, saying no more.⁶ It is clear that Mangan, like Peer Gynt, has ignored his real self, simply because he has over-evaluated it, and has sought fame in a manner that runs counter to his basic nature. He is manifestly unfit, both by temperament and by intellect, to be a business tycoon. The question remains, What is Mangan's real self?

Mangan's real self is a matter that Shaw, true to the mysteries that surround human nature in actual life, does not clearly elaborate. But he does hint at it, and the hint appears to have taken shape from a comment that he had included in *The Quintessence*. Speaking of the elderly Peer Gynt, who has returned from his forty years of fortune-seeking, Shaw had written: "In the imagination of this old woman [Solveig] he finds the ideal Peer Gynt."⁷ As the readers of Ibsen's play know, Peer is a mediocre man at best — a man who is not worthy of universal admiration. Aside from his mother Ase, only Solveig has learned to love him. In her mind — and only in hers — Peer Gynt has existed, throughout the forty years of his wanderings, as the ideal man. Mangan, once he has been disillusioned that happiness lies in the outward appearance of success, seeks a solution precisely similar to that attained by Peer Gynt. Led on to believe that Hesione Hushabye is in love with him, he craves to be idealized by her. The self-realization that he has acquired as a businessman is, as he learns, only a delusion: in the area of world affairs, he has found out that he is an over-blown balloon and, once punctured, is a nobody. The esteem that he has gained is esteem for the inflated shell and not for the man hidden inside it. Hence, like Peer Gynt, he must

³ Shaw, *The Quintessence of Ibsenism*, New York, 1910; pp. 56-57.

⁴ Heartbreak House, loc. cit., p. 458.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Shaw, *The Quintessence*, p. 58.

⁷ Heartbreak House, loc. cit., p. 467.

⁸ The Quintessence, p. 56.

seek the proof and the apotheosis of his ideal self within a sphere far more limited than the arena of world affairs, to which by nature he does not measure up. In Mangan's infatuation for Hesione, in his intent to rent a place near her house, in his later discovery that she had given him the "glad eye" only to break up his romance with Ellie Dunn, and in his subsequent dejection of spirit, there is the clear hint that the potential self-realization of his nature is identical with that of Peer Gynt: namely, that his ideal self, if he hopes to find it at all, lies in the thoughts of a woman. The final and clearest hint that this is the solution sought by Mangan occurs as he leaves the stage for the last time: his parting words, "But if you only knew —," are significantly addressed to Hesione. We may ask ourselves, if she only knew *what*? It seems to me that Mangan, had he been bold enough to reveal his secret, would have gone on something like this: "If you only knew that you alone can save me; if you only knew that I seek myself — my true self, fully realized — in your love, in your thoughts." But aside from Mangan's imploring tone, Shaw holds back the mystery; and my conclusion as to the secret but unspoken thoughts of Mangan is predicated, in part, upon the striking parallels that elsewhere exist between him and Peer Gynt. Both men are mediocre, both have a driving passion for renown, both seek their fame in the world of finance, each of them hides behind the illusion that he is a man of importance, and finally both Mangan and Peer discover the utter emptiness of their life-efforts. But Peer, unlike Mangan, is saved at the end from complete oblivion: he discovers his identity, his ideal self, in the love and thoughts of Solveig. Mangan, rejected by Hesione and then blown sky-high by a blast of dynamite, leaves behind him only a name written, as it were, in wind-blown sand.

The idea that Mangan seeks the apotheosis of self in the thoughts of a woman are indicated early in the play; he has become "engaged" to Ellie Dunn as the result of a courtship which he himself has initiated and which has taken time and energy away from his business exploits. This courtship, like Mangan's later infatuation for Hesione, has a close prototype in Ibsen's *Peer Gynt*; the particular prototype is Peer's wooing of the Mohammedan girl, Anitra. After he has made a fortune as a slave-trader, lost it, and then dreamed of establishing an empire in Africa, Peer is suddenly aware of the futility of acquiring self-realization through grandiose projects: "I mean to reign . . . not on Gyntiana's shores . . . But enthronéd in the freshness/Of a woman's virgin thoughts."⁹ Mangan's courtship of Ellie Dunn is likewise a compromise, a diversion from exhausting ambitions which are beyond his capacity. Both romances, moreover, assume a similar vein. Anitra absconds with Peer's money and jewels. Ellie desires Mangan only for his wealth. But Mangan has no wish to purchase a wife; his ultimate longing, like Peer's, is to be "enthronéd" in a woman's thoughts. He wishes to see himself as a strong and solid ideal, admired not for what he is supposed to possess in the way of money and position, but for what he is. For this reason, the money-minded Ellie has not the capacity to satisfy Mangan's desire of self-realization; he jilts her in favor of the siren-like Hesione.

⁹ Hendrik Ibsen, *Peer Gynt*, in *The Collected Works*, ed. William Archer, New York, 1907, vol. IV., p. 161. (Act IV, sc. 7.)

Two or three comparatively minor aspects of the "Gyntish self" are given emphasis in *Heartbreak House*, but they are bequeathed to another character and not to Boss Mangan. Peer is one of fiction's most extravagant liars. As far as living the lie — that is, following a life and assuming a pose contrary to one's nature — Mangan does about as well as Peer; but he is no match for him in the first phase of deception, which is the commonplace telling of lies in contrast to the living of them. In *Heartbreak House*, the counterpart of Peer, the teller of lies, is Hector Hushabye; his colorful fabrications make other people suppose that his entire life is "one long romance." But in the art of deceiving both oneself and others Hector never advances beyond the preliminary stage: he fabricates untruths; however, unlike Mangan, he does not attempt to live a life that is beyond the capacity of his natural aptitudes. It is noteworthy that Hector also wears an Arab costume, which is intended to enhance his good looks. This idea seems to have been suggested to Shaw by the middle-aged Peer's assumption of a Turkish costume. To Hector, Shaw has given the more superficial qualities of Peer Gynt: a passion to tell lies, extremely handsome features, and a vanity of dress. But, unlike Peer and unlike Mangan, Hector accepts the frustration of his environment. He tells lies, but he does not turn his whole life into a lie by seeking success and fame in occupations for which he is unsuited. He follows the precisely opposite course, that is, the luxury of doing nothing. In the characterization of this enchanting loafer, Shaw is tipping us off as to what happens to a Peer Gynt who has found self-realization at an early age. In the first act of the play Hector tells Hesione: "You fascinated me; but I loved you; so it was heaven."¹⁰ In Hesione's thoughts — that is, in her love for him — Hector has already, indeed years ago, found the apotheosis of his ideal self. Hence, he need no longer strive: once self-realization has been attained, a man's highest incentive, according to Shaw's implication, is likely to be gone forever. Peer Gynt and Mangan never cease in their efforts because they have not found the complete realization of the ideal self. But Hector has attained self-realization too easily. He still possesses the outward trappings of Peer Gynt, in particular the capacity to tell lies, but his life has become totally stagnant because of a want of incentive. By this interpretation, Hector is the Peer Gynt who might have been. Had Peer, when still a young man, been able to remain with Solveig, it is highly probable that he would have found, at that time, his ideal self: its full bloom had already crystallized in her thoughts. In creating Hector, Shaw seems to be telling us: "It's a wearisome matter to have to strive after self-realization; but look what would have happened to Peer Gynt if he had found his self-realization at too young an age. He would have become a positive loafer; indeed, he would not possess the incentive of a well-fed lap dog."

Ibsen, in *Peer Gynt*, has shown us the gruelling effort to attain self-realization, especially when a man seeks it in a manner contrary to his nature. Shaw, indicating his greater variety of philosophic outlook, not only creates a Boss Mangan who, as the twentieth-century counterpart of Peer Gynt, is in desperate search of the ideal self; he also shows us, in the character of Hector, the easy satisfaction and the consequent danger attendant upon the early attainment of self-realization. Thus he

¹⁰ *Heartbreak House*, loc. cit., pp. 399-400.

depicts a dilemma. But he gives us an answer to this dilemma in the character of Ellie Dunn. Having been persuaded by Captain Shotover that money is not the *primum bonum* of life, she finds her ideal self unfolded in his thoughts and goes so far as to make a spiritual marriage with him. For Ellie, the ideal self that she discovers is not an end-attainment which destroys further incentive. On the contrary, once it has been revealed, it awakens her to the type of young woman she is; namely, a person who has the courage to forget about financial security and to confront the dangers of a highly uncertain future. Hence, the revelation of the ideal gives her, for the first time, confidence in herself. By contrast, Hector has been hypnotized into a ne'er-do-well by the siren-like Hesione: in her thoughts he has found his ideal self revealed as an incomparable charmer of women. Aside from an occasional flirtation, he has been lulled into a life that has become completely devoid of action. When the enemy bomber flies overhead at the play's end, the frustrated Hector, aware of the aimlessness of his life, seeks his destruction as well as that of Heartbreak House. But Ellie Dunn, who has found "hope for the young," faces the danger for quite another reason: in confronting it, she senses the strength of her fearless soul and, with it, the beauty of living. Unlike Hector, she does not wish to be destroyed; she recognizes the bomber as a symbol of anarchy and, in facing the danger that it imposes, she finds proof of her own courage — a courage now dedicated to the restoration of an ordered society both in England and on the continent.

By introducing the character of Ellie Dunn into the play, Shaw has resolved the problem of self-realization more adequately than did Ibsen in *Peer Gynt*. Hector, as I have interpreted him, is the Peer Gynt who might have existed, had the latter attained an early self-realization. By contrast, Boss Mangan, who seeks the ideal of self in the arena of world affairs and fails miserably, is the "pushing, competitive, success-loving" counterpart of the actual Peer Gynt as depicted by Ibsen. Ellie Dunn, alone of the characters in *Heartbreak House*, finds a self-realization in the right way, the way that leads to a constructive life, simply because she is a person who, at heart, is devoid of vanity and self-interest. She embodies Captain Shotover's philosophy: "A man's interest in the world is only the overflow from his interest in himself."¹¹ Ellie has discovered that the strength of an individual is dependent largely upon the negation of self-advantage. Upon awakening to the ascetic character of her nature, she observes: "I feel now as if there was nothing I could not do, because I want nothing."¹² To her, self-realization is not the principal goal of life; it is, instead, the means to a more noble objective.

Had *Heartbreak House* been written by Ibsen and not by Shaw, few readers would look upon it as a particularly difficult play. Accustomed to Shavian optimism, we are perplexed by the atmosphere of disillusion which pervades *Heartbreak House*. We are confronted by the most helpless, the most world-weary, the least purposeful group of characters that have been created by an author of sanguine temperament. They are of the stamp that we find in the dramas of Ibsen, Chekov, and O'Neill. By contrast, the typical Shavian character — Tanner, Captain

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 442.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 445.

Bluntschli, Caesar, Andrew Undershaft, and Higgins — is a cocky egotist well satisfied with himself, indeed somewhat too aware of his high potential in life. He is an embodiment of Shaw's unshakable confidence in himself. *Heartbreak House*, moreover, is not the first play in which Shaw treated the problem of self-realization. *The Devil's Disciple* and *Androcles and the Lion* consider this problem, but in a most matter-of-fact manner. Neither Dick Dudgeon, Anthony Anderson, nor Androcles makes a conscious and painstaking effort to attain the realization of self; each of them finds his niche in life as the result of a natural sequence of events. In their ultimate attainments, they are the product of Shaw's take-it-for-granted attitude that success, for any man, lies just around the corner. None of them shares with Mangan — and with Peer Gynt — the wearisome, almost heartbreaking, struggle to arrive at the ideal of self.

As is clear from the preface to *Heartbreak House*, World War I, including the circumstances leading up to it, had subjected Shaw to a painful disillusionment. It was not the sanguine and wholesomely optimistic Shaw that wrote *Heartbreak House*; the play was written by a man whose confidence in the human race had been shattered, almost overnight, into fragments. To Shaw, his fellowman was no longer self-reliant and self-responsible. The instability of the world, as he saw it, resulted primarily from two flaws common to human nature, and each of them had to do with the problem of self-realization. Europe, according to Shaw's interpretation, did not lack men who possessed the basic culture and breadth of mind to administrate the affairs of state. But he also recognized that men of culture are not, as a rule, persons of ambition — persons, that is, who seek an exalted ideal of self. The fault of cultured Europeans tended in the opposite direction: their ambitions did not measure up to their intellectual potentials. Many of them, in the manner of Hector Hushabye, had accepted the realization of the ideal self too readily — indeed, at a level of experience much inferior to their actual capabilities — and hence they had been lulled into apathy: for them, no vital incentive remained toward further advancement. They had become the pillars of the purposeless social clique of which *Heartbreak House* is the symbol. The more positive danger, in Shaw's mind, stemmed from people of Mangan's character. These men, narrow-minded and ambitious, were not satisfied to seek the realization of self within an environment commensurate with their intelligence; in consequence, they had scrambled upward into the important posts of industry and government. The drive for self-realization, as Shaw looked upon the matter, had vaulted the intellectually unfit — and not the natural leaders of society — into the responsible arena of statecraft. That Mangan ultimately turns his mind from the world of industry and seeks the realization of self in the love of a woman attests to his frustration, and hence his utter incompetence, as a business tycoon. Shaw describes him as having "a careworn, mistrustful expression . . . and features so entirely commonplace that it is impossible to describe them."¹² The arena of grave responsibility has exhausted him. In Shaw's interpretation, the makers of England's policy — Mangan and men of his caliber — had unhappily come to the point of exhaustion, and hence possible retirement,

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 388.

at least four or five years too late. Completely deficient in the qualities of leadership, they owed their high places of responsibility to a commonly shared trait: each was a desperado in search of an exalted ideal of self. In the meantime, they had brought upon England – and especially her governmental policies – the plague of intellectual bankruptcy.

Although horribly disillusioned by the stupidity that had engendered World War I, Shaw was able to salvage one solid fragment of his customary optimism. Ellie Dunn, as he portrayed her, is the prototype of what he was confident would be a new generation of Englishmen, a generation capable of rebuilding the England that had been brought to wreckage by men of Mangan's caliber. But this new generation, he tells us, must free itself from certain cancerous traits, such as the craving for money, which are not inborn but which have been implanted within the mind, usually during adolescence, by the doctrines of a distorted social order. The self-realization attained by Ellie liberates her from the commonly accepted notion that a principal aim of life is to acquire financial security. Her triumph is made complete by the discovery that she is a woman totally devoid of self-interest and hence has the courage to face any exigency of the future, no matter what may be her personal sacrifice. Unlike Hector and his kind, she does not fall victim to the smug satisfaction that arises when the realization of self is accompanied by a strong egocentric habitude. Indeed, she reaffirms the Shavian habit of optimism. In the portrayal of Ellie Dunn, Shaw envisions a new and enlightened England – an England governed by an intelligent generation that has put aside both expediency and self-interest. This vision is the sanguine hope of a man whom darkest consequences could not completely frustrate.

COMING IN THE MAY ISSUE

"Some Shavian Links with Dublin as Recorded in the Holloway Diaries"

by Michael J. O'Neill

"Mrs. Warren Comes to America; or The Blue-Noses, the Politicians
and the Procurers"

by George E. Wellwarth

COMING IN THE SEPTEMBER ISSUE

"Bernard Shaw's Marxist Utopias"

by Paul A. Hummert

(part of a special feature accenting the plays of GBS's later years)

Bahr Describes GBS on the Platform

by John J. Weisert¹

The following impression of Shaw the orator was published by Hermann Bahr in the *Neue Freie Presse* of Vienna on January 19, 1911. When Bahr's imminent arrival in London had been foretold to Shaw early in February, 1910, the latter described himself as "terrified," for he had not read any of the books the Viennese man of letters had so conscientiously sent him ever since that momentous first performance of "Ein Teufelskerl" at the Raimund-Theater on February 25, 1903. Nor could either speak the other's language comfortably. Wisely allowing himself time to perfect his knowledge, however, Bahr did not attempt to track down the Fabian until the ensuing autumn, when communications between them were established in English. (a meeting at Shaw's residence eventually resulted.)

Toward the end of 1910 Shaw spoke from the platform of the Memorial Hall in Farringdon Street, London. The Independent Labour Party was holding a meeting to discuss the abolition of destitution and unemployment. Bahr characteristically relates in detail his reaction to the fog and the audience entering the hall. Within, George Lansbury spoke first. Bahr directs his attention to the other speaker and reports:

Shaw sits quite quietly and mannerly nearby, so that meanwhile I can observe in peace his extremely provocative skull.² The blond hair has become entirely white and the thick beard, too; but in between there is a warm glow, for this confirmed teetotaler the whim of fate has given a Burgundy nose, whose fiery radiance bathes the whole face in a romantic sunset. In addition, it violently leaps forward, really up and away from the face, whereby the whole form of the head is, so to speak, contradicted and suddenly questioned in a mocking manner. Such noses, that go boldly forth into the world, are possessed by very sensuous men, the gourmands, the Don Juans, also often the greedily scenting financiers. This nose would jerk the whole man out into adventures were it not restrained by a fanatic spirit, which one sees lurking on the forehead and in all kinds of corners around the small, water-blue eyes with their angular brows. Here everything is spirit, as if just before an approaching explosion, uncannily like an ammunition dump that can fly into the air at any moment. Thus from both sides, threatened at the same time by an insistent sensuality and a domineering intellectualism, the face seems

¹ Dr. Weisert is an Assistant Professor of Modern Languages at the University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky.

² "Provocative" is a freer rendering than "debatable" in the phrase *seinen hochst fragwurdigen Schadel*. As to the meaning, I think from the point of view of Gobineau and other racists a skull was always "debatable." While I do not think Bahr belonged to this lunatic fringe, I believe he did mean that one debated in one's own mind whether this skull belonged to saint or devil, poet or peasant, etc. The phrase in its more literal sense may seem obscure today, as the habit of reading character from physiognomy has fallen into disrepute.

to be able to assert itself only with the greatest effort, for which reason it overcompensates, as it were, and becomes a caricature; heaven and hell fight for this face, and it still hopes to escape from both with a jest.

Now he stands up, steps to the railing of the platform, and as, with folded arms, he there looks into the crowd, or rather, really scintillates, he is just opposite me. Seen thus, he has all at once a strangely pious seriousness in his features, which become smooth and suddenly as if redeemed; it is now the head of an apostle, over which the shadow of a faun, filled with goatish forest merriment, seems to pass recurrently, whenever he turns it in speaking and shows me the profile. But his voice has also that deeply convictive seriousness; it comes very hot from within him. As an orator, he has nothing of the purveyor of chitchat and nothing at all of the great speaker. No, the effect is entirely that of a deponent. Like one whose breast will burst, if he cannot finally disburden his heart. God help me, I cannot do otherwise — that is the basic tone. But it is so by no means emphatically, rather with hesitation, and as if he would harden himself against it, but is overcome from inside by it; indeed, there is fear in the way in which he pours out his cold rationalism, in order to deaden or at least to dampen his feelings. Then there is a great hissing, which one calls "Shavian"; thus arises his kind of wit, which is a letting off of inner steam, a rescue from his own erupting passion by throwing his wit upon the next thing that comes his way. He never prepares his witticism in advance, but he always slips into the joke. Just as in anger one tears a handkerchief, or, symbolically, in order to calm oneself, one breaks a pencil in the excitement, so he twists the neck of some word or other. He tells, for example, that he recently discovered somewhere that the nearest employment registry was thirty miles distant. As he says that, such indignation gathers in his voice because of this ordering of the world, which seems to mock its own stupid incapacity, that one thinks to hear in it, how he is now about to clench his fist and let go. But a breath, the escape valve is opened, and he says: "How fortunate is a country, where evidently each unemployed always has his automobile at his disposal."

Often his wit is only a monstrous short cut, in order to finish quickly what is for him too stupid for serious refutation. He speaks of the theme that unemployment today is unavoidable, because industry needs sometimes more and sometimes less work. "Good, but then we must care for and preserve those that industry now cannot use, until it can use them again."

Exactly as in peace we also maintain the military, which is employed in wartime, just for war. Or we would have to be consistent and also pay no salary to the officers for the time being, but say: "Wait for the next war; now we have no work for you, you can meanwhile go a-begging until the German invasion!" After this, he stops; one has heard in his tone of voice his disgust at the eternal chatter about the German invasion. It seems now that he will throw his rage upon the wretched phrase. But he only says, very shortly, in passing,

without twisting his mouth: "Until the German invasion — next Thursday, you will find the hour in the evening papers."

And likewise when he says: "I constantly hear preaching about the love of poverty. I do not have this love at all. In nowise do I love poverty, rather I hate it; I hate it so much, that every means seems to me right, in order to destroy it." The listeners laugh. But in this laugh is pilloried the whole hypocrisy of worldly benevolence.

Since I have heard Shaw speak, I know that his plays have been staged completely wrong in Germany up to now, because his vital component has been lacking in all these productions: passion. Shaw is not a rocket, as is believed in Germany. He is a holy fire watched over by a cold intelligence.

But I also know now, that it is a matter of indifference how one plays him and what one thinks of him, either here or there. That does not matter. The important thing is that somewhere in the world this fire is burning.

- - - - -

From The Shavian Past I

Another new Shavian venture in the drama is the one-act "Six of Calais." This work was first performed last July in the open-air theater in Regent's Park, London. Shaw, in his coy fashion, named Froissart, the historian, as his collaborator.

The jovial and bewhiskered Irishman, who is one of the century's most gifted dramatists, waved aside the fact that Froissart had been dead nearly 500 years. The new work is a twentieth century commentary on the heroic burghers of Calais. Shaw says that Froissart "got it all wrong," because he did not understand women.

The Philippa of the Shaw play gains a hearing by loosing a flood of tears of such volume at the feet of her embarrassed husband that he becomes most discomforted. She then recalls to him the many favors that she has asked of him, and reminds him that he has never failed to grant her most elaborate desire.

How then, she questions, can he refuse her so trifling a boon as the lives of half a dozen ragged starving wretches.

*A feature of this *al fresco* première came as a result of the clamors of the audience for the author when the final curtain was rung down. Shaw unexpectedly marched on the stage.*

"Ladies and gentlemen," he said, "be reasonable; you can see for yourselves that the author isn't in the house."

— William P. Sears, Jr., in *The Literary Digest*,
February 2, 1935.

Shavian Dead Letter File

Year after year booksellers issue sale and auction catalogues which offer (and often quote from) letters and other manuscripts of Shavian interest. Since these publications are notoriously ephemeral, Shaviana appearing in this fashion are regularly preserved vit this department. Readers are urged to call such citations to the attention of the editor.

In Catalogue 482 of Goodspeed's Book Shop, Inc., Boston, appears Shaw's reply to John A. Lincoln, who sent him a typewritten manuscript of an essay: "The Drama. The Position of the Young Playwright." The article complained that the young playwright of artistic conscience had little chance of getting his work produced because theatre managers distrust the serious play and seek only drama with obvious commercial possibilities. On the first page G.B.S. penned: "This is all tosh: it is not about real categories, but about catchwords of the press. You send such things to editors on the chance of getting a few shillings for them, not to ME. G.B.S." In a separate letter, dated 4th Oct. 1924, he wrote:

I will not read your play; and the enclosed article will explain why you were very unwise to ask me to.

Nobody's opinion is worth two pence as to whether a play will be a box office attraction or not. Managers often have to produce plays they don't believe in simply because they must keep the theatre open, and for the moment must take what they can get. That is where the beginner gets his chance.

Your ambitions, your circumstances, your desire to marry concern nobody but yourself, and have nothing whatever to do with your play's chances of production.

If you imagine that your earnings as a playwright are likely to enable you to despise Ealing and live in Whitehall Court you may depend on being rudely disillusioned.¹

In the second number of *The Collector* for 1958 appear several brief offerings, all from postal cards. One, dated December 13, 1937, is addressed from Ayot St. Lawrence to George Seldes:

I cannot remember the exact wording of the statement to which you allude; but what I meant was that in my experience a man who calls himself a 100% American and is proud of it is generally 150% idiot politically. But the designation may be good business for war veterans. Having bled for their country in 1861 and 1918, they have bled it all they could subsequently. And why not?

¹ Shaw actually did prepare at one time a pamphlet, "What a Playwright Should Do with His First Play," in order to unburden him of this type of correspondence. The pamphlet was to be sent without comment to an author (who submitted his maiden playwriting effort to Shaw) when the MS. was returned. Apparently it was not disseminated widely, for copies of the pamphlet are rare.

Another, on a small correspondence card, addressed to Charles McEvoy (who often successfully dunned Shaw), is dated from Ayot St. Lawrence on April 8, 1916: "Can't trust you even to borrow enough. You had better have twenty." Following the "GBS" is the postscript:

"The gravedigger here stopped me the other day to ask how you were — quite unprofessionally."

In the Catalogue No. 1, Spring, 1958, of Winifred A. Myers, London, appears excerpted a folio letter addressed to Arthur Goddard, *The Lady's Pictorial*, dated 11 Dec. 1910, asking that

you should give the writer of the enclosed cutting a friendly blowing up . . . my contribution to the subject, which is accessible in print to anyone who takes the trouble to verify statements before making them public, is a demonstration of the utter impossibility of the State Stud Farm proposal, & the necessity of trusting solely to Nature in marriage. . . . it is a serious thing to lend the circulation of the L. P. to a recklessly false statement that I am a supporter. . . . My opinion carries weight, rightly or wrongly, with a sufficient number of people to make the statement mischievous. . . .

A lesser item in the same catalogue, dated from Adelphi Terrace in 1910 to an unnamed addressee, accompanied "snapshots taken in 1898 during my illness. You can take your choice for a lantern slide. . . . they are new to the public."

From Catalogue No. 10 of Charles Hamilton Autographs, New York, comes an early A.L.S. addressed from Woking, Surrey, Dec. 2, 1902, in which G.B.S. attacked misleading medical statistics as well as immunization for typhoid:

I have come to class [medical] science with witchcraft and doctors with spiritualists. . . . A friend of mine went out with a troopship as civil surgeon and injected the serum freely. The men were very ill; and those who afterwards got typhoid got it most violently. My wife's brother-in-law, who commanded a regiment in South Africa, had to organize the water supply from rivers well stocked with dead horses and dead men. No distilling apparatus, of course: instead, reliance on the serum. Result, wholesale typhoid. . . .

Catalogue No. 228 of the Carnegie Book Shop lists Shaw's reply to an ambitious composer regarding music for "some scraps sung by one of the characters in my play 'Caesar and Cleopatra.' As these scraps are not supposed to be consecutive, and have little rhyme and less reason, I am rather at a loss to conceive a song being made for them. Have you a copy of the music . . . ?" The letter, dated from Tunbridge Wells, 26 March 1902, probably refers to lines sung by Apollodorus in the third act, described by Shaw as "*in barcarolle measure to the rhythm of the oars*":

"My heart, my heart, spread out thy wings:
Shake off thy heavy load of love —"

and

"My heart, my heart, be whole and free:
Love is thine only enemy."

His ferrying job coming to an end, Apollodorus later swings his bale of carpet (with Cleopatra hidden inside) onto the lighthouse parapet, while again breaking into song:

"Aloft, aloft, behold the blue
That never shone in woman's eyes —"

A series of Shaw manuscripts were noted and quoted in the Sotheby (London) catalogue of 23rd and 24th June, 1958. A typewritten letter from 10 Adelphi Terrace, 6th February, 1914, to Lady Russell, criticized her plays and offered her some playwriting suggestions:

. . . You could make quite a nice little play by showing a black-mailer completely defeated, without any adventitious aid, by (a) an innocent and fearless sort of person who never made a secret of anything, or (b) a person with a tremendous conscience who, on being brought to conviction of sin by the blackmailer, insisted as a matter of duty on surrendering to the police and expiating the crime, as well as bringing the blackmailer to justice for an attempt to blackmail. There would be some real comedy in this. . . .

A letter to J. Y. McPeake, either 18 July or 7 October, 1921, discussed the Disarmament Conference with uncanny foresight:

. . . The whole affair will be humbug anyhow. It is now quite clear that armaments on the most gigantic scale can be improvised, and this is the only way to do it, as prepared armaments are always out of date before they are needed. If the Powers are convinced that big ships are as obsolete as bows and arrows, they will make a big parade of agreeing not to build them. . . .

Two excerpts were quoted from a group of four letters to the Rev. Armand de Candole, Rector of Ayot St. Lawrence, and his wife, the correspondence covering the years 1923-36:

. . . I never speak now in public even on politics when I can help it; and as to speaking on Art, Literature, Music, The Drama, Humane Killing, Vaccination, Vivisection, Famine Funds, and all the other subjects on which I am supposed to be eloquent, I should spend the shortened remainder of my life on the platform without a single evening's respite if I hesitated to hurl a brutal NO at every petitioner. To you I must excuse myself more mannerly. . . .

We landed in Cork the day before yesterday to find the dockers on strike. We had to unload the ship ourselves. The dockers looked grimly on at a multitude of small women struggling with large trunks. . . .

From a series of postcards, the earliest dated 1904, comes an early Shavian remark on the printing of his plays, a matter GBS always took very seriously. Apparently he took writing them as being a significantly more valuable utilization of his time, for his correspondent was informed that "after all writing plays is more important than publishing them — one of the few points on which I agree with Shakespear."

Reviews:

Bernard Shaw and Nineteenth Century Thought

Bernard Shaw and the Nineteenth-Century Tradition, by Julian B. Kaye, Norman, University of Oklahoma Press, 1958, pp. xvi 222, \$4.00.

One of the prime reasons for Shaw's unique value is that, unlike anyone else, he summed up in himself the best of later nineteenth-century thought. Shavians have sometimes had to recognize, however, that the limitations in Shaw's vision during the post-World War I period derived largely from his essentially nineteenth-century outlook.

Professor Kaye surveys the chief elements in the nineteenth-century intellectual tradition that contributed to the formation of Shaw's mind, to support his thesis that Shaw's often erroneous assessments of the twentieth-century world arose from this background. While his account is on the whole adequate, it covers what for Shavians is familiar ground, much of it in a pretty superficial way.

In a brief introductory chapter the synthesis of religion and science is identified, following Basil Willey, as the chief intellectual problem of the nineteenth century, and Shaw's own synthesis of late nineteenth-century "tendencies" is emphasized. Mr. Kaye proceeds in succeeding chapters to a detailed and painstaking survey of the main nineteenth-century "influences" that Shaw felt. He makes much of Carlyle's influence, particularly in the sphere of political ideas. While Carlyle's importance is undeniable, Mr. Kaye has, in my opinion, considerably overemphasized his direct influence. On the other hand, the influence of Ruskin and Dickens is given too little emphasis by the author. His description of both Carlyle and Ruskin as Puritans who appealed to Shaw because of the Puritanism of his own make-up seems valid.

The third chapter contains the best discussion of J. S. Mill's contribution to Shaw's thought that I have read. What Mr. Kaye here makes clear, that the Fabian program was more Millite than Marxian in philosophy, certainly deserves emphasis. The discussion of Comte in the same chapter is suggestive without being as cogent as that of Mill. Comte and Mill figure again, along with Matthew Arnold, in the next chapter, in which Professor Kaye demonstrates that Shaw's own religious ideas had precedent in the Religion of Humanity of the nineteenth century. In Chapter V Butler's influence in Shaw's reaction against Darwinism is dealt with, along with that of Bergson. A long section devoted to William James points out interesting parallels between James's Pragmatism and Shaw's outlook, though Mr. Kaye is careful to add that James exerted no discernible influence on Shaw. The final section of the chapter discusses the influence of Nietzsche.

Chapter VI concerns Goethe, Schopenhauer, Blake, and Shelley. Mr. Kaye's estimate of Shaw's indebtedness to these men is, on the whole, sound, though he seems to underrate and to some extent misunderstand the influence of Shelley. Shaw's vegetarianism, while largely influenced by Shelley, was not founded principally on compassion for animals, as Mr. Kaye seems to believe. The character Marchbanks, contrary to Mr. Kaye's impression, cannot be taken as a deliberate portrait of Shelley except on quite superficial grounds.

In Chapter VII the roles of Henry George, Marx, the marginal utility economists, and Edward Bellamy in the formation of Shaw's economic ideas are described. Mr. Kaye's emphasis on the importance of Bellamy as an influence may seem excessive to some.

Mr. Kaye's survey is concluded in Chapter VIII, where Ibsen, Wagner, and Morris receive attention. The discussion of Ibsen and Wagner is, on the whole, perceptive. On the other hand, the treatment of Morris is inadequate and minimizes his strong personal as well as ideological influence on Shaw.

The final chapter, "Shaw in the Twentieth Century," is concerned principally with the limitations in Shaw's reactions to the post-World War I world, especially his favorable view of the dictators, Communist and Fascist. Here Mr. Kaye is attempting to drive home his point, that Shaw's was essentially a nineteenth-century mind and that the weaknesses in his twentieth-century reactions derived mainly from this. I believe that this is valid. However, Mr. Kaye dwells too exclusively on the weaknesses, and largely overlooks Shaw's many reactions to the world of our century which reveal acute and accurate insight.

It is difficult to determine the basis on which Mr. Kaye organized this book. The survey is not chronological order, either as to the lives of the writers represented or as to the order of their impact upon Shaw. One finds, for example, "Romantics and Early Evolutionists" *after* "The Rebellion against Mid-Century Mechanism." Some writers, like Nietzsche and Wagner, or Ruskin and Morris for that matter, that one might expect to be treated together are treated in separate chapters. Moreover, the chapters do not always have much relation to each other. The final chapter, ostensibly based on the preceding ones, has only a rather tenuous relation to them.

This book smells of the dissertation. The numerous footnotes often irritate more than inform, and some of them (for one who knows the works referred to) are almost meaningless. The book is sometimes repetitious, this arising inevitably from its organization as well as from the author's habit of making the same citations in both footnotes and text. The style is often heavy and infelicitous. I could have done with fewer *Zeitgeists* and *Weltanschauungs*, and I also felt that the word as well as the concept "influence" was overworked.

In spite of these cavils, however, I must in all fairness say that Professor Kaye has done a conscientious job of handling, however, superficially, a great mass of material in treating an important aspect of Shaw which has hitherto not received book-length consideration. That Shaw's outlook was in important ways essentially a nineteenth-century one, in

both its virtues and its limitations, Mr. Kaye has clearly enough demonstrated. This is not, however, an anti-Shavian book, and certainly Mr. Kaye's final plea, that he be "conceived a good Shavian although — or rather because — I have not spared Shaw" should be admitted.

The University of Oklahoma Press has done a distinguished job of printing on this book. The splendid portrait of Shaw by Karsh of Ottawa serves as a frontispiece.

E. E. Stokes, Jr.¹

Shaw On Education

Shaw on Education, by Louis Simon, Columbia University Press, 1958 (281 xiii, index). \$5.50.

The author's final sentence: "Interpreted in terms of the democratic ideal, Shaw's doctrine of Creative Evolution presents a profound challenge to philosophy of education": is at once an adequate summary of the emphasis of the book and an indicant of the haze in its focus. The direction of the study (all too loosely divorced from its dissertational status) wavers between explicating Shaw and making the right bows to an educational Mecca. The latter effort includes several reprimands to "disillusioned teachers" — otherwise identified as "teachers who despise teaching" — and several bouquets to Shaw when his opinions are in "agreement with the pragmatists." The book, in other words, is as much "Education on Shaw" as it is "Shaw on Education."

What the book does do, and thoroughly, is express from the plays, prefaces, and tracts every reference to schools and learning and catalog these (though vertically) under such headings as "Education and the State," "Personality," "Planning the Schools," and "Diverse Education." Creative evolution and socialism are the ground in which these ideas grow: "experiences primarily in the fields of art, controversy, and the theatre" are the trellises on which they bloom.

— John McKiernan²

Magnus and Orinthia on Wax

The Apple Cart: Interlude between Acts One and Two; and [nine] poems by Noel Coward, performed by Margaret Leighton and Noel Coward; 33 1/3 rpm twelve-inch record (New York: Caedmon, 1958), \$5.95.

Some day *The Apple Cart* will be recorded in full. Until that millennium, Shavians will have to thank Caedmon for a recording of the

¹ Dr. Stokes is an Associate Professor of English at Texas A. & M. College.

² Dr. McKiernan is Chairman of the Department of English and Foreign Languages at the State University Teachers College, Geneseo, N. Y.

famed *Interlude*, where the King, fresh from a joust with his cabinet, refreshes himself at Orinthia's boudoir. The performance – albeit by talents of the first order – doesn't quite come off. The lightness and vivacity by which the unique King-mistress relationship is controlled by Magnus are overshadowed by the world-wise gravity of Mr. Coward, who, attempting irony, achieves it only intermittently. Miss Leighton seems closer to Shaw's intent, but casts a sophisticated hardness that is but one side of the clever and kittenish Orinthia.

Completely faithful to the GBS text as far as it goes, the Caedmon performance ends as Orinthia grapples with Magnus, attempting to make him late for tea with the admittedly dowdy Queen Jemima. It is not the actual end of the *Interlude*, however, for the scandalous scene is interrupted – and ended abruptly – by a summons for the King. Apparently in order to write out two lines given to Sempronius, the *Interlude* as recorded closes with the uninitiated listener unaware that Sempronius is going to knock and enter, leave in surprise and knock again more loudly.

The other side of the record displays the performers in completely congenial circumstances, reading Mr. Coward's verses with delightful mock-gravity.

– Mark Bennett¹

Ozy Pleased

The Shaw Society of America and the Metro-Goldwyn Mayer organization honored each other on the eleventh of December, when the Society accepted an invitation to a private preview of *The Doctor's Dilemma*. This play, written in 1906, has at last been converted to film – and a right good convert it is, too. Produced in England, the film makes it quite apparent that there are a number of other persons besides this reviewer who persist in adhering to the reactionary that what was good enough for Shaw is good enough for them. Producer Anatole de Grunwald has commendably resisted the current tendency to orchestrate or otherwise adulterate GBS for the sentimentally inclined, and has given us a film of a Shaw drama.

The Doctor's Dilemma, Shaw's seventeenth play, is said to have been inspired by a visit to his friend, the eminent physician Sir Almroth Wright, at St. Mary's Hospital. It was also at about this time that Shaw was under attack by his great friend William Archer in connection with GBS's belittling the importance of death as an integral part of drama. Archer, no mean controversialist, argued that "If, in Mr. Shaw's own phrase 'the illumination of life' is the main purpose of drama, what

¹ Shavians will recall that Mark Bennett, in an earlier record review (of *Saint Joan* in the January, 1957 *Shaw Bulletin*), called for a complete recording of *The Apple Cart*.

illuminant, we may ask, can be more powerful than death?" To which GBS replied in a publicity release couched in the third person:

Mr. Bernard Shaw has . . . [written] a new play. It will be of special interest to readers of *The Tribune*, as it is the outcome of the article in which Mr. William Archer penned a remarkable dithyramb to Death, and denied that Mr. Shaw could claim the highest rank as a dramatist until he had faced the King of Terrors on the stage. Stung by this reproach from his old friend, Mr. Shaw in writing a play all about Death, which he declares will be the most amusing play he has ever written.¹

Since Shaw characteristically denied responsibility for the authorship of this release, it is safe to disagree with the reporter insofar as its being the "most amusing play" Shaw has ever written. *The Doctor's Dilemma*, despite its recurrent wit and occasional jocosity, is a serious play containing people and problems as alive now as it was when written. Today we still have stumbling medicos impressed with their own importance and infallibility, pontificating upon the moralities whilst callously committing their crimes under the protection of Science; as well as (and this is another major theme of the play) artists revolting against the stultifying commonplaces of society in their search for a life that is nobler. These Shavian preoccupations have been captured and retained intact in this beautiful and courageous film. Despite the amputation of Dr. Schutzmacher ("Cure Guaranteed") in his entirety, and the minor excisions of such keen observations as "All professions are conspiracies against the laity," Director Anthony Asquith has, by his understanding and obvious affection for Shaw, made a knotty and exacting play into a clear, well-constructed and superbly acted motion picture.

Grunwald has ensnared Alistair Sim, Robert Morley, John Robinson, Felix Aymler and Michael Gwynn for the roles of the doctors, Dirk Bogarde for Louis Dubedat and Leslie Caron for Jennifer. It is not possible to single out any performer for particular mention without committing an injustice to the others, but it will not be easy to forget Bogarde's touching death-bed affirmation of his faith nor Miss Caron's obedience to the dying Dubedat's hatred of "that hell of crepe and crying and undertaker's horrors." Also, certainly, we cannot close without a tribute to Maureen Delaney as Sir Colenso's maid Emmy — who surely must have been drawn from Miss Delaney.

And all this in technicolor, too! I am going to see it again, and this time gladly pay for the privilege.

— Ozy²

¹ Quoted in A. Henderson, *George Bernard Shaw: Man of the Century* (New York, 1956), p. 606.

² The pseudonymous Ozy, crusader-in-chief against adulterations of Shaw, is best known for his pamphlet "The War against Bernard Shaw."

A Continuing Check-list of Shaviana

compiled and edited by Charles A. Carpenter, Jr.¹

I. Works by Shaw

- Letter (facsimile), in Abraham A. Roback, *Freudiana* (Cambridge: Sci-Art Publishers, 1957), 99. "When I was young . . . I said that a science of psychology was impossible. . . . Dr. Freud proved that I was right."
- "Letters to Alice Lockett," in *The Armchair Esquire*, ed. by Arnold Gingrich and L. Rust Hills (New York: Putnam, 1958), 331-39. Reprinted from the "Special British Issue" of *Esquire* (April, 1958).
- "On His Seventieth Birthday," in Lewis Copeland, ed., *The World's Great Speeches* (2nd rev. ed.; New York: Dover, 1958), 208-11. A speech in which Shaw lambastes government and censorship while defining socialism and capitalism.
- Postcard, in Maurice Watling, *This Is Illyria* (Ilfracombe: Stockwell, 1958), 166. Concerns Shaw's refusal of the Nobel Prize (unaddressed).
- Play Reprints: *The Devil's Disciple*—again with introduction and notes by A. C. Ward—has been issued by Longmans, Green of London as the last of ten reprints of individual plays announced for publication.

II. Shaviana — Books and Pamphlets

- Arnold, Armin, *D. H. Lawrence and America* (London: Linden Press, 1958). Includes some useful bibliographical information on Shaw-Lawrence relations.
- Cardus, Neville, *Talking of Music* (London: Collins, 1957), 283-88. A favorable critique of Shaw as a music critic.
- Clurman, Harold, *Lies Like Truth; Theatre Reviews and Essays* (New York: Macmillan, 1958), 135-46 and *passim*. Five reprinted reviews: two on *Saint Joan* (the Uta Hagen and Siobhan McKenna performances), one each on *The Apple Cart* and *Major Barbara*, one on Shaw in general.
- Daiches, David, *The Present Age in British Literature* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1958), 149-52 and *passim*. A largely debunking summary of Shaw's contributions to drama, based partly upon conventional critical misconceptions (of *Candida* and *Saint Joan*, for example).
- Ewen, David, *Complete Book of the American Musical Theater* (New York: Holt, 1958), 198-200. Details on the genesis and production of *My Fair Lady*.
- Fay, Gerard, *The Abbey Theatre, Cradle of Genius* (New York: Macmillan, 1958). A readable history of a theatre that often presented (but except for *Blanca Posnet* never "cradled") the plays of Shaw. A complete list of performances is included.
- Kerr, Walter, *Pieces at Eight* (London: Reinhardt, 1958), 112-13, 117-20, 159-62. Perceptive generalizations on many aspects of Shaw: how to ruin his plays by "giving them the old Stanislavski"; the nature of a fine performance of *Heart-break House* (intellectual passions "bouncing off the walls of the theatre").
- Langner, Lawrence, "A Visit to G.B.S.," in George Oppenheimer, ed., *The Passionate Playgoer; a Personal Scrapbook* (New York: Viking Press, 1958), 420-23. Another reprint (partial) of "The Sinner-Saint as Host," from the July 22, 1944, *Saturday Review*.
- Macqueen-Pope, Walter J., *St. James's, Theatre of Distinction* (London: Allen, 1958). An unscholarly history of an unShavian theatre, containing much material on Shaw's contemporaries.

¹ Mr. Carpenter, Shaw Review Bibliographer, is Librarian at the Goldwin Smith Library, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York. Readers, writers and publishers are urged to call contemporary Shaviana to the Bibliographer's attention.

Poirier, Philip P., *The Advent of the British Labour Party* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1958). An attempt to account for the emergence of the Labour party as a major political force, with a chapter on "Marxists and Fabians and the Idea of a Labour Party," and with frequent reference to Shaw's views.

Richards, F. T. Grant, *Author Hunting . . . ; Memories of Years Spent Mainly in Publishing* (London: Grant Richards, 1958). Reissue of a book, first published in 1934, which is well-known as a source of Shaw letters, opinions on authors, publishers and publishing, etc.

Simon, Louis, *Shaw on Education* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1958). Derived from a 1956 Ph.D. dissertation. Reviewed in this issue.

Stamm, Rudolf, "George Bernard Shaw and Shakespeare's *Cymbeline*," in Don C. Allen, ed., *Studies in Honor of T. W. Baldwin* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1958), 254-66. A thorough scholarly study which includes adverse criticism of Shaw's *Cymbeline Refinished*. "We conclude that Shaw's approach . . . was limited by a number of doctrinaire opinions, but much more by the nature of his mind and taste, which belonged in the classicist tradition. . . . [However] he had the born dramatist's flair for the theatrical physiognomy of the plays."

Sullivan, John, G. K. Chesterton; a *Bibliography* (London: University of London Press, 1958). Lists a number of items by and about Shaw. The index is not complete.

Villars, Jean Beraud, *T. E. Lawrence; the Search for the Absolute* (London: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1958). A translation of the 1955 French edition. Includes the essential minimum of exposition on Shaw's marked influence.

Williams, Raymond, *Culture and Society, 1780-1850* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1958), 179-85. "Shaw and Fabianism." Stresses the "ironic twist" in Shaw's adherence to evolutionary theories: Fabian social evolution on the one hand, Shavian personal evolution on the other.

Wilson, Edmund, *The American Earthquake* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1958), 490-95. "Bernard Shaw at the Metropolitan," a quizzical, impressionistic record of a speech on Socialism given by Shaw in 1933.

III. Shaviana — Periodicals

Boas, Robert, "Death of a Shavian Dustman," *Drama*, new series, no. 50 (Autumn, 1958), 36-37. A comparison of Shaw's Alfred Doolittle with that of *My Fair Lady*, demonstrating with acuity that much is lost in the adaptation.

Freedley, George, "The 26 Principal Theatre Collections in American Libraries and Museums," *Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, LXII (July, 1958), 319-29. Descriptions of the scope and special emphases (in regard to theatre rather than drama) of outstanding collections, with bibliographies of material giving more detailed information.

Gassner, John, "Broadway in Review," *Educational Theatre Journal*, X (October, 1958), 244-45. Perceptive comments on the reasons for the comparative failure of the Theatre Guild's "skeleton" version of *Back to Methuselah*.

Gertz, Elmer, "One Hundred Years of Shaw," *Manuscripts*, IX (Spring, 1957), 74-76. A brief description, by the President of the Chicago chapter of the Shaw Society, of the centenary exhibit of Shaviana, a rich collection which was microfilmed for the use of scholars.

Glicksberg, Charles I., "The Modern Playwright and the Absolute: the Decline of Tragedy," *Queen's Quarterly*, LXV (Autumn, 1958), 465-66. *Heartbreak House* is discussed as a tragedy in which Shaw "poured out all his wrath of disenchantment."

Hyams, Edward, "Bernard Shaw's Barber," *New Statesman*, LV (June 28, 1958), 831-32. A discursive personal essay which at least (and at most) identifies one of Shaw's barbers.

- Inglis, Brian, "Well, Would He?" *Spectator* (London), no. 6775 (May 2, 1958), 555. A rather trivial attempt to throw a "Freudian" light on the question of Shaw vs. *My Fair Lady*.
- Jones, Frank, "Unpublished Shaw: Grammar and Communism," *Times Educational Supplement* (London), no. 2248 (June 20, 1958), 1041. Four letters from Shaw in response to a grammarian's leg-pulling criticism, with triumphant comments by the grammarian. Shaw's digressions include an incidental attack on English schools, typical references to Communism, and a defense of distinctly poetic principles of grammar.
- Miller, Arthur (as interviewed by Phillip Gelb), "Morality and Modern Drama," *Educational Theatre Journal*, X (October, 1958), 190-202. Gives the complete context for Miller's remarks on Shaw which were printed in the September, 1958, *Shaw Bulletin*, p. 19.
- Pearson, Hesketh, "My Uninvited Collaborator, G.B.S.," *Horizon*, I (November, 1958), 18-21, 134-37. Anecdotes and conversations omitted from Pearson's biography, with sidelights on Shaw's intervention.
- The Regional*, II (October, 1958). Issued by The New York Regional Group of The Shaw Society (London). Includes a reprint of Shaw's "Does Modern Education Ennoble?" and a brief article on the possible significance of names in *Major Barbara*.
- The Shavian*, no. 13 (September, 1958). The journal of The Shaw Society (London). Includes "A Shavian Musical" by Hesketh Pearson (it "would have exasperated him"); Shaw's "The Author as Manual Laborer" (from *The Author*, LIV, Summer, 1944, 45-47); a previously unpublished Shaw letter to Bache Matthews; and a valuable "Literary Survey."
- Shenfield, M., "Shaw as a Music Critic," *Music and Letters*, XLIX (October, 1958), 378-84. Shaw the music critic resembles Voltaire the philosopher: both are superb journalists, viewing their subject with comic detachment; both insist upon the rigorous application of common sense to accepted biases; both are propagandists and iconoclasts rather than system-builders.
- Stamm, Rudolf, "Shaw und Shakespeare," *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, XCIV (1958), 9-28. Attributes Shaw's perceptivity as a Shakespeare critic to the "Verwandtschaft des Dramatikers Shaw mit dem Dramatiker Shakespeare, denen . . . nicht nur die Gabe, eine Geschichte zu erzählen, die Macht über die Sprache, der Humor, der Sinn für eigenartige Charaktere gemeinsam waren, sondern auch ein reicher Besitz an jener Lebensenergie, welche, wie es scheint, die wirklich unterscheidende Eigentümlichkeit hinter den guten, den schlechten und den gleichgültigen Eigenschaften des Mannes von Genie ist."
- Williamson, Audrey, "Wagner and Shaw: a Dramatic Comparison," *Music Review*, XIX (August, 1958), 186-91. A markedly undramatic comparison of Shaw's and Wagner's ideas: their affinities in regard to socialism and the concept of the Superman, the "rift between the Wagnerian humanistic and Shavian intellectual philosophy."

IV. Shaviana — Dissertations

- Since these items are not examined by the bibliographer, reference is given to the abstracts found in *Dissertation Abstracts* (DA) or *Speech Monographs* (SM).
- Salovac, Ivo, "The Dramatic Works of George Bernard Shaw and Their Repercussions in Croatia." Zagreb, 1957. Reviewed in *The Shavian*, no. 13 (September, 1958), 44-46, by H. M. Geduld.
- Spencer, Terence James, "The Dramatic Principles of George Bernard Shaw," DA, XVIII (February, 1958), 594 (Stanford University).
- Weales, Gerald Clifford, "Religion in Modern English Drama," DA XIX (July 1958), 142 (Columbia University). Includes a large section on Shaw.

Shavian News Notes

THE SHAW REVIEW replaces the less accurate *Bulletin* designation in our title beginning with numbers issued in 1959. The Editorial Board feels that the substitution of *Review* better indicates the journal's scope. Bulletin-type information will continue to appear in the News Notes columns, and information for this department is always welcomed by the editor.

SHAW SOCIETY OF AMERICA MEETINGS. The New York Chapter presented a dramatic reading of Shaw's rarely performed one-act Italian renaissance melodrama, *The Glimpse of Reality*, as the highlight of the November meeting. Priscilla Gillette appeared as Giulia, Bernard Barrow as Count Ferruccio, David Hurst as Squarcio, Phil Burns as Sandro. At the October meeting Curtis P. Freshel, President of the Vivisection Investigation League, spoke on "The Humane Shaw." At the December meeting Professor Warren S. Smith of the Penn State Theatre Arts Department spoke on "The Deslys Affair: A Shavian Debate on Stage Morality." The Shaw Society of Chicago presented a dramatic reading of two contemporary short plays as the December offering in its series: *The Wrecker*, by Saul Bellow, and *The Interview* (a world premiere) by J. P. Donlevy.

SHAW PRODUCTIONS AROUND THE NATION. Off-Broadway fare for Shavians was *Captain Brassbound's Conversion*, offered from October through December by the Players West at Grace and St. Paul's Lutheran Hall. . . . Four companies of *My Fair Lady* continued to fill houses on Broadway, and in Chicago, London and Australia. . . . The Canadian Players, Ltd., toured in a Shaw-Shakespeare repertory for its 1958-59 season, offering *The Devil's Disciple* and *As You Like It*. . . . The Penn State Players presented an unusually staged *Too True to Be Good* at University Park, Pa., in October. . . . At Greeley, Colorado, in November, the Little Theatre of the Rockies offered *Arms and the Man*, while the Columbia University Teachers College in New York City produced an arena-style triple bill of *Passion, Poison and Petrification*, *The Dark Lady of the Sonnets* and *The Man of Destiny*. . . . *Man and Superman* was featured by the Antrim Players, Suffern, N. Y., in November and December, and the University of Minnesota Theatre in Minneapolis presented *Saint Joan* in December.

PASSING OF A SHAVIAN. Dr. Edward J. West, Shavian scholar and editor of *Shaw on Theatre*, and [Shaw's] *Advice to a Young Critic and Other Letters*, succumbed to a heart attack November 2, 1958, at Boulder, Colorado, where he had been on the University of Colorado faculty since 1927. He was 55.

MAN AND SUPERMAN TO BE FILMED. Herman Levin, producer of *My Fair Lady*, is reported to have secured motion picture rights to *Man and Superman*.

DRAMATIZATION OF SHAW-CAMPBELL CORRESPONDENCE. Jerome Kilty, actor-director, has created a two-character comedy — *Dear Liar* — from the forty years of correspondence between Mrs. Pat

Campbell and GBS. After a nationwide tour beginning in Phoenix, Arizona, on March 3, the company will play a limited engagement in New York City. After the first six weeks of touring college towns, legitimate theatres and concert series auditoriums *Dear Liar* will take a summer vacation, resuming travel on October 9, and arriving on Broadway in December for what is tentatively set as a four-week run. Other bookings follow for early 1960. Katherine Cornell and Brian Aherne will share the billing, and S. Hurok and Guthrie McClintic will be listed jointly as producers. The dramatization will include brief scenes from *Pygmalion*, which was written especially for Mrs. Campbell, and *The Apple Cart*, which owes its Magnus-Orinthia *Interlude* (according to well-established legend) to a real-life episode between playwright and actress.

DRAMATIZATION OF SHAW-TERRY CORRESPONDENCE. The Bernard Shaw-Ellen Terry letters, first published in 1931, will be adapted for stage presentation. Dramatic rights have been acquired by Jerry Leider, producer of John Gielgud's *Ages of Man*. Mr. Leider intends to utilize the bare-stage convention, using three actors to present the correspondence — one to play Shaw, one Ellen Terry, and the third (who would function as narrator) to play Sir Henry Irving, who was frequently Miss Terry's leading man. Possibilities for the Shaw and Terry roles are James and Pamela Mason.

A MISSING PORTRAIT OF BERNARD SHAW was reported by *The Irish Times* to have been discovered in October:

It is a very famous portrait, and its history is somewhat mysterious. The late Sir Desmond MacCarthy, literary and dramatic critic, decided that it should be bought for the new National Theatre. A man of very great charm, only he perhaps could have persuaded some most distinguished people to subscribe heavily to the project, among them Sir Winston Churchill, who gave £100, and is well noted for having very little admiration for Shaw.

The idea came first from the present Lord Lytton, who put it forth in a "whimsical way." Perhaps Sir Winston was similarly affected. The picture shows Shaw seated on a throne in curious robes, holding an orb in one hand, and wearing a red skull-cap on his head. It was painted by the last Lord Lytton in a Chelsea studio in 1905, and bought for the National Theatre a year before he died, in 1950.

Since then it has been missing. Today, however, it was discovered hanging in Knebworth House, the home of the present Lord Lytton's cousin, Lady Cobbold, who is wife of the Governor of the Bank of England. All that is wanted now is a National Theatre.

THE FILES OF THE THEATRE GUILD, including letters, scripts, prompt books, reports of play readers, press books and financial records, have been given to the Yale University Library. The papers, covering nearly forty years of Broadway producing, will prove a rich vein for Shavian and other theatre scholars to mine for a considerable time to come. The history of the reception and first performance of Shaw's plays in America after the First World War is largely the history of the Theatre Guild.

HEARTBREAK HOUSE DUE FOR REVIVAL. Harold Clurman will direct an all-star cast in a fall or winter Broadway revival of *Heartbreak House*. It is planned that the company will tour for several months along the college town-concert series circuit before settling down on Broadway. One possible cast member may be Michael Redgrave. The producer, Robert Joseph, previously co-produced the Broadway revival of *Major Barbara*, in which Charles Laughton directed an all-star assemblage.

HEDGEROW THEATRE TO REOPEN. The lights go on again in April at the oldest repertory theatre in the United States, Hedgerow Theatre, in Moylan (near Philadelphia), Pa. Closed since 1956, after 33 years of presenting classic and modern plays, including many too uncommercial for larger playhouses, Hedgerow had been known nationally for its productions of Ibsen, Shaw and Chekhov. Eighteen full-length Shaw plays have appeared in its repertory. Its first production, on April 21, 1923, was *Candida*.

WELLS-SHAW CORRESPONDENCE TO BE PUBLISHED. Among the Wells Papers projects at the University of Illinois Library is the preparation of an edition of the extant correspondence between H. G. Wells and Bernard Shaw. Professor Gordon N. Ray, biographer of Thackeray and of Wells (the latter now in progress) is editor. Selections from the letters appeared in 1956 in the Henderson centenary biography of Shaw. Publisher of the Wells-Shaw letters will be the University of Illinois Press.

PASSING OF A FABIAN PHILOSOPHER. GEORGE D. H. COLE, retired Oxford Professor of Social and Political Theory and President of the Fabian Society since 1952, died on January 14 in London. His *A History of Socialist Thought* (completed in 1956) is regarded as a landmark in political economy. During much of the twentieth century he was one of the chief philosophers of the Socialist movement in England.

GEORGE JEAN NATHAN PAPERS. The personal library and private papers of the late theatre critic have been willed to the Cornell University Library. The library part of the bequest has already been received.

MORE ON SHAW COURSES. Professor Norbert F. O'Donnell of Bowling Green State University (Ohio) reports a Shakespeare and Shaw graduate seminar, supplementing his GBS course, and organized around comparisons and contrasts of the dramatic forms in which Shakespeare and Shaw worked and comparisons and contrasts of their treatment of certain basic themes, such as the theme of power and the theme of love.

THE SHAW SOCIETY OF AMERICA, INC.

OFFICERS

President

Archibald Henderson
721 East Franklin Street
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Active Vice Presidents

Richard Aldrich
Felix Grendon
Leonard Lyons
Maxwell Steinhardt

Honorary Vice Presidents

Gene Tunney
Katharine Cornell
Samuel Goldwyn
Upton Sinclair

Secretary

Benj. C. Rosset
1014 Jennings St.
Bronx 60, N. Y.

Treasurer

David Marshall Holtzmann
36 West 44th Street
New York 36, New York

Board of Directors

Richard Aldrich
Sara Arlen
Warren Caro
William D. Chase
Alexander Clark
Felix Grendon
Archibald Henderson
David Marshall Holtzmann
Basil Langton
Leonard Lyons
Benj. C. Rosset
Warren S. Smith
Maxwell Steinhardt
Mrs. Kenneth Taylor
Gene Tunney

OBJECT

To study and interpret George Bernard Shaw's writings, work and personality; to make him more widely understood and appreciated; and to provide a meeting ground for those who admire and respect the man.

HOW TO BECOME A MEMBER

Any person agreeing with the object of The Shaw Society of America, Inc., and wishing to join the Society may apply for membership. Address your application to the Treasurer (David M. Holtzmann, 36 West 44th Street, New York 36, N.Y.). The annual fee is \$5.00. Checks should be made payable to The Shaw Society of America, Inc. Membership fees are tax deductible, and are determined on a calendar year basis.